

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
WESTERN DIVISION**

LAWRENCE GOLDBLATT, )  
Plaintiff, )  
v. )  
MINA HERRON et al., )  
Defendants. )  
No. 4:09-CV-0748-DGK

## **DENYING PLAINTIFF'S "MOTION TO NOTICE THE COURT"**

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff’s “Motion to Notice the Court” (doc. 76). It is somewhat unclear what Plaintiff is seeking by moving to “notice the Court;” it appears he is notifying the Court that his foreclosure had been rescheduled in the hope that the Court would enjoin his foreclosure proceedings, something the Court has previously declined to do. In the alternative, Plaintiff asks the Court “to merge or join the case at hand [09-0748] with the newly filed legal action [10-01183],” another case in which Plaintiff has sought to enjoin foreclosure on his home. The Court construes Plaintiff’s motion as a Rule 42(a)(2) motion to consolidate actions.

“[C]onsolidation is permitted as a matter of convenience and economy in administration, but does not merge the suits into a single cause, or change the rights of the parties, or make those who are parties in one suit parties in another.” *Johnson v. Manhattan Ry.*, 289 U.S. 479, 496-97 (1933). In the present case, the Plaintiff has not explained why it would be more convenient or efficient to consolidate these cases. Accordingly, the motion is DENIED.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATE: August 10, 2011

/s/ Greg Kays  
GREG KAYS, JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT